

understood himself what he said. It is plain that the final St. Peter was a far more modest and humble person than the impetuous man of Tarsus—they might almost have exchanged characters. We might venture to think that 1 Peter v. 3 was meant to be a quiet allusion to the autocratic egotism of his rival and fellow laborer. “Neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.”

St. Paul never seemed to forget himself; he was perpetually pushing to the front and (though of course unconsciously) advertising himself and his sufferings. Never man endured so much misery as he did—he positively died daily. The churches must have grown rather tired of his endless lamentations and intolerable woes. St. Peter merely said, “Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you. But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings.”

## PRO-ALLY LITERATURE.

BY THE EDITOR.

BEFORE me lies a pamphlet entitled *Germans in America* by Lucius B. Swift of the Indianapolis Bar. It is a paper read before the Indianapolis Literary Club, the first edition of which amounted to 5000, and we have now the second edition of 10,000. The purpose of the brochure is to increase the tension that pro-British interests have undertaken to produce between the United States and Germany, emphasis being laid on the reproach made to the hyphenated Americans for sympathizing with the Huns of Europe.

It is difficult to say whether the author’s ignorance is greater than the malevolence with which he treats his subject or *vice versa*, perhaps both are equal. The innumerable errors and misrepresentations may be unintentional, but they are certainly displayed with a spitefulness which is most regrettable and can do no good whatever.

In his address Mr. Swift represents Germany as a land that stands for autocracy, and the Anglo-Saxondom of England as the stronghold of liberty. Here is a sample of the author’s knowledge of Prussian history:

“The Teutonic Knights having conquered Prussia, became in-

subordinate and unruly, and a succeeding Hohenzollern of Brandenburg was given the job by a German emperor of bringing them to reason, which he did in a thoroughly Hohenzollern manner, with fire and sword. He was now Elector of Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia. These two provinces not originally German territory at all, but colonized by Germans, who mixed much Slavic blood, were combined into the kingdom of Prussia. The rule has always been and is to-day autocratic."

Every child who has studied German history in school knows that the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire had nothing to do with the German knights in Prussia. The knights elected the leaders of their order, and the last grand master of the order, a member of the Hohenzollern family, had been elected by his fellows. His knights did not become insubordinate and unruly, but on the contrary they ceased to be dangerous; they began to die out. The fact was that times had changed; the Middle Ages had passed and the era of the crusaders was gone forever. The order had recruited itself from the pious Christian aristocracy of the Fatherland, and the other orders, the Templars and Knights of St. John, had disappeared. The old members of the German knights died one by one and new ones did not present themselves to fill the gaps thus made. So the last master, a Hohenzollern, undertook a journey to the Fatherland to see why the German order had been forgotten. When he reached Germany, he heard of the Reformation and of the new spirit that had come over the world; he soon realized that the crusaders and knights errant had become out of date. The grand master of the venerable order became desperate: What was to be done? The advice given was "There is but one man who can help you, that is Luther." So he went to Wittenberg and saw the Reformer, Dr. Martin Luther. The result was the transformation of the order into a modern state. The grand master of the order became the head of the government and his followers changed from a band of crusaders into secular knights. No fire and sword was necessary, for the practical result was a number of merry nuptials. The grand master of the order and his celibate knights no longer felt themselves bound by their vows and so married.

History is not so bloody as Mr. Swift would make us believe, and the union between Prussia and Brandenburg came about through the fact that the line of Prussian Hohenzollern died out and their territory fell by inheritance in the most peaceful way to the elder line of Hohenzollern, represented by Frederick William, in history called the Great Elector of Brandenburg.

It is not worth while refuting all the misstatements of Mr. Swift. This one instance may be sufficient.

In contrast to the history of Prussia, English and American history are extolled, and our author says:

"There is in the German line no Magna Charta, no John Hampden, no Oliver Cromwell, no axe in the hands of the people descending on the neck of a traitor king, no king driven from his throne for betraying his trust, no Bill of Rights, no Declaration of Independence, no Minute Man, no Liberty Bell, no George Washington, no Abraham Lincoln. Of all these marks blazed during the centuries Germans in America to-day are apparently oblivious."

Is it really a disgrace that the Germans were not regicides? That no Hohenzollern made himself enough hated to be officially beheaded? Our author does not seem to know what the Magna Charta really stands for in history. The Magna Charta expresses the discontent of some nobles, and does not contain anything of a government of the people, for the people and by the people, but it sounds well to quote it as if it were a great accomplishment.

The coat of arms of the Lord Mayor of the City of London bears a dagger in remembrance of his method of dealing with Wat Tyler, the leader of the oppressed peasants. This assassination was officially approved by the king. That is the reverse of a Magna Charta, and it is characteristic of the English government that assassination for the sake of the ruling party is not considered a criminal act. Think of Findlay and Sir Roger Casement.

England is not the home of the Saxons, and its original inhabitants were not oppressed by the Anglo-Saxons but exterminated. It is true that Prussia was not German territory, but its Slavic population, the Mazurs, are yet living and have preserved their language to this day. In Brandenburg the people have become assimilated to German habits and culture; many Slavic names still survive in the aristocratic families of the country.

The home of the Anglo-Saxons was in northern Germany; the truth is that they brought thence their love of liberty which they developed in their own way. Mr. Swift recognizes it, but he believes that the Germans of Germany lost their liberty. He says:

"Yet we started even. If we go back to the Germans in the German forests the lines meet; for German tribes were self-governing. 'No man dictates to the assembly,' says Tacitus: 'he may persuade, but cannot command.' The Angles, the Saxons, the Jutes and the Frisians, uncontaminated by Rome, carried into England the ancient German freedom, the town moot, the hundred moot, the

folk moot. They swept Roman England free of inhabitants and of Christianity. When the movement was completed a nation of Germans occupied England, the only German nation resulting from the migration of the barbarians. They were pagans and Odin was their god. These were our forefathers. Out of this pagan German nation has come the English-speaking race of to-day. Although a multitude of times crushed to earth, they never forgot their republican institutions, their mass township meetings, their delegate meetings, and never lost their capacity to transact public business. War brought the king, but the king could not shake off the witenagemote, the predecessor of parliament. In their meetings the kicker kicked out his kick; there the officers, even the king, were called to account; there for centuries was carried on the stubborn fight of the people against oppression. These facts to-day apparently make no impression upon Germans in America. It is not necessary to trace how or when the Germans in Germany lost their liberties; they lost them."

It is not worth while to enter into the mazes of a confusion which seems to be intentional. Of further misrepresentations we will mention only one or two. If Bismarck when asked whether he would retain his office at the death of William I is represented to have answered that "he would on two conditions, the first of which was 'no parliamentary government,'" this is a positive error. In Bismarck's time the parliamentary government was not abolished, but when he molded the German constitution he introduced parliamentary government on manhood suffrage instead of according to the class system in use in the state constitutions, and Mr. Swift may know that manhood suffrage does not as yet exist in England.

I may be permitted to point out that the author's misrepresentation concerning the so-called conflict between King William I of Prussia and the Prussian legislature is astonishing. Mr. Swift describes it as follows:

"In 1861 Bismarck and the king wanted to enlarge the army but the legislature refused the money. They spent the money just the same, saying that the legislature by refusing to vote necessary supplies had laid down its functions and the king must take over the responsibilities that they declined to exercise. Having defied the constitution for years and spent the money, in 1866, after the seizure of Schleswig-Holstein and the victory over Austria, the speech from the throne announced, says Bismarck, 'that the representatives of the country were to proceed to an *ex post facto* approval of the administration carried on without appropriation act.' The legislature obeyed the order almost with gratitude for the opportunity. An



Anglo-Saxon legislature would have shaken the king over hell-fire, would have brought him to his knees in repentance, would have made him reaffirm every declaration of Anglo-Saxon freedom from Magna Charta to the Bill of Rights before granting forgiveness."

If Mr. Swift had happened to know the real facts he would be more careful in explaining why King William felt it his duty to enlarge the army in 1861. King William at that time saw the need of Prussia's preparedness because Prussia was endangered and faced the difficulty of serious conflicts which meant war. Either Prussia or Austria had to be the leader of Germany and the sword alone could decide. He recognized the necessity of preparedness which the delegates in the Prussian parliament did not understand. He foresaw the danger, recognized his duty to prepare his country for war, and seeing that the *Landtag* was opposed to the plans which with his better insight he knew to be indispensable, he had an interview with Bismarck and wanted to resign. But Bismarck tore up the resignation of the king which the latter had handed him and said, "A Prussian king does not resign," and then pointed out to him that the crisis was inevitable and the question was whether or not he would act according to his conviction. His duty was to do the best he could in the interest of the country, even if opposed by the representatives in the *Landtag*. Bismarck added, "I am willing to risk my life, and if you need me I will undertake the task for you."

That was the beginning of Bismarck's greatness. When the plan of William I proved to be right, when the wars had come and Prussian preparedness did its work, Bismarck did not stand up and declare, "We were right after all and we had better abolish the constitutional government." On the contrary, though history had justified the king's policy, he stepped before the *Landtag* and demanded "indemnity" for the breach of the constitution, and the *Landtag* freely and without opposition granted the indemnity. There was no threat nor any system of an autocratic influence, but an unequivocal recognition of the constitution.

What would William I have done if he had been an English king, or what should he have done in Mr. Swift's opinion? Would or should he have crawled before Parliament and said: "I obey your behests although I am positively convinced that you are wrong?" Should he have been cowardly enough to act against his own conviction? Should his conscience have been a negligible factor? On the other hand, if an English king had broken the constitution under the same conditions, would the English parliament

have forced him to his knees and humiliated the honor of their king who had proved wiser than the wise legislators? I hope the English parliament would have acted more sensibly than in the way proposed by Mr. Swift.

We are told that the Germans have lost their liberties, but the truth is that in Germany there is more personal liberty than in either Great Britain or America, and the enforcement of law and order is handled with more discretion and greater respect for personal liberty there than either in England or in the United States. This is well known to people who know the three countries, but pro-British people in the United States like to misrepresent facts.

The truth is that the emperor of Germany is not a czar nor does the aristocracy exercise any undue influence. Royalty in Germany stands for the old traditional institution of folk kingship. Among the Latin peoples the king was a ruler, the Roman name of the king was *rex*, but in Teutonic countries the king was the father. He was the authority to whom they looked as the representative of the whole people, of all that were akin, and so he was called "king," or *König*, the representative of the whole tribe, standing as their father or elder brother. The etymology of the word indicates that the main ideal of kingship among the Saxons and all the Teutonic races was very different from the Latin idea of the ruler of the people. The word "queen" was derived from the same root, which is noticed also in another spelling of the word, *quean*, meaning "woman." It means the woman or mother of the people, of all who belong to the tribe, who are kin.

As is known to all who know German conditions, the present emperor is still the folk-king in the old pre-historic sense, the father of the country; and his sovereignty has proved to be a modern development of this old traditional idea of the king as the father of the fatherland. There is no hatred between him and his people, for he is not a tyrant or oppressor of the people's liberty. On the contrary, he is looked up to as the defender of their rights and privileges, and he is this to all people, to those of old-fashioned conservative views, to the liberals, and even to the extreme radicals.

There is a little story which was published in several German papers which illustrates this truth, so little recognized in America. One of the Social Democratic delegates visited Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg. When the emperor heard of the presence of this extremist he said to the chancellor, "I should like to see him too," and the man was called back. While he was walking through the garden he was stopped by a sentinel who having received a hint that

everything was all right allowed the Social Democrat to go his way to meet the emperor. The latter had noticed the little scene and when his visitor turned after the conversation was over, the emperor called him back once more and said: "It may interest you to know on what kind of guards I have to rely for the protection of my person." When the delegate showed his perplexity in trying to understand what the Kaiser meant, the latter remarked: "All these sentinels whom you see throughout the garden are Social Democrats."

The truth is that every one in the German empire has a right to hold his own views and he may elect a conservative representative or a Social Democrat, but with all the radicalism of the Social Democrats the king might walk into one of their assemblies and they would hail him without exception. He would not be in the slightest personal danger. They might express their preferences for the introduction of socialistic principles into the laws or even for the introduction of a democracy as the best form of government, but they would feel that personally the emperor stands in the place of the representative of the nation, to whom they look up as children to their father. A nation needs a department which is commonly called the government or the administration, and it is pretty indifferent whether we call the man at the head of it *Kaiser* or *President*. The history of Germany has adopted the former title under the influence of contact with Rome and a deep-felt respect shown for Christianity. That the dignity of a Kaiser, or chief of the administration should be hereditary, or in other words that a family should be chosen to furnish the incumbants of this office is a secondary matter which may have its drawbacks but is not without good features. It renders the election campaign unnecessary and makes it possible that a man may be educated for his high duties so as to raise him above the very suspicion of using political intrigues to attain what the the law of the country gives him as his birthright—an advantage which has in many respects worked well and has produced men who though born to a throne have done their governmental work in a most outspoken way as "first servants of the state."

This is a truth which is well recognized all through Germany, even in the circles of those who are professed Social Democrats and would prefer to have a republican form of government.

After all, the difference between a republic and a monarchy is not so important as is generally represented in republican states. The liberty of the people is not conditioned by the form of govern-

ment, but by the people themselves and the application of the laws. We Americans are in the habit of misrepresenting all monarchical governments with the possible exception of the English government, which is erroneously said to be like a democracy. But the truth is, there is more liberty, more independence, more freedom in Germany than in England, and the ideal of liberty has come down to us from ancient Germany. It is only in the misguided mentality of the present war that we are blind to facts and distort history in favor of our own and of British prejudices.

Another lecture by the same author is entitled *America's Debt to England*. He claims that our schoolchildren are taught that the foundations of liberty are based upon the revolution; they ought to know that "the fathers fought for the rights of Englishmen and won. They not only secured to us imperishable blessings, but they freed every English colony from a selfish colonial policy." Our author does not forget that Saxon freedom is a Teutonic heirloom. He says: "No youth should leave school without knowing that our Anglo-Saxon forefathers carried representative government from the forests of Germany into England."

The principle of a judgment by peers is an old Germanic law. When our author says "the germ of the jury appeared in France" he ought to have said in "the institution of the Franks," which is a little different, for it existed before France originated. Our author forgets to point out that Germany to-day is in many respects freer than the United States, and the laws by which it is administered are more than in England or any English-speaking nation a product of the people's will in a regular course of parliamentary methods and according to a logical system of acknowledging the inalienable rights of all people. There are more important and broader documents in the history of the European continent than the Magna Charta which contained little more of the spirit of liberty than did the claim of the southern slaveholders for the liberty to keep slaves, in which England supported them. Would it not be better to speak out bluntly that the Saxons are a Teutonic tribe and claim that they originated somewhere else and that the American revolution was not directed against England, but that England made this revolution against the Kaiser who threatend to take possession of the country by his Hessian soldiers who came here under the sly pretext of having been imported by the English government?

Mr. Swift's case is not an exception; it is typical of pro-British literature. Most of the essays and books that take the British side



in the present war betray gross ignorance and exhibit a curious bitterness toward Germany.

There is a common belief that truth will always prevail *in the end*, that lies have short legs; but *the end* is sometimes far away, and misrepresentation is as efficient as picric-acid bombs. They are not good weapons and may be efficient for a while only, but they are very powerful and their greatest drawback consists in the fact that they are mostly used by those whose cause is both indefensible and hopeless. Are we justified in drawing a conclusion from the obvious fact that pro-British literature (with very few, but no glaring, exceptions) is extremely one-sided, lacking in logic, based upon error and involving lamentable ignorance? Read the wild denunciations of the German cause, and Horace will speak out of the recollection of your school days:

*"Difficile est satiram non scribere."*  
( 'Tis hard not to become satirical.)

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### THE FIRST TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY EMIL BAENSCH.

Whenever good fortune brings within your view a ten-dollar bill, one of those yellow-backed ones called a Gold Certificate, take a good look at it. You will find on it the likeness of a gentleman of the old school, with these words underneath: "Michael Hillegas, First Treasurer of the U. S."

He was born in Philadelphia whither his father had emigrated in 1724 from near Heidelberg, in Germany. Pennsylvania was the Mecca of German emigration in the eighteenth century, as many as 12,000 arriving in one year. The elder Hillegas became one of the merchant princes in the city, and his prominence, as well as his inclination, rendered him a friendly adviser and helpful guide to the newcomers.

His death in 1749 transferred the management of his business to his son, then barely twenty-one years of age. An administrator's bond of forty thousand pounds and an inventory of personal property covering fifteen pages of the probate records, attest the value and extent of the estate. This was considerably increased under the skilful and energetic direction of the son. He acquired substantial interests in sugar refineries, iron forges, land companies, fishing companies, etc. He was one of the organizers of the well-known Lehigh Coal Company and was a charter member of the Bank of North America, still one of our strong financial institutions.

Like the father, the son became one of the leaders in the colony. In those days it was the custom to raise funds frequently for public purposes, even for the building of churches, by means of a lottery, and public confidence instinctively pointed to Hillegas as the proper manager. For ten years, from 1765